

1249 Hi Point St.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90035
June 15, 1968

Dr. Luis Alvarez
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, Calif. 94720

Dear Dr. Alvarez:

You say in your letter of June 8 that you would take seriously my concern about CBS' failure to notify the public of the one-second limitation in your method only if, when published, my work contains a proviso noting that I ". . . cannot eliminate the possibility that 13 more shots were fired in a frame (I) designate as coinciding with a shot".

Your suggestion that my finding of five hits cannot by itself establish the maximum number of shots fired is not only well taken, but is a fact which I have recognized from the first, and which I usually call to the attention of interested parties. In fact, I have long believed that in addition to the five hits, at least one additional shot missed--a shot which I cannot pinpoint by studying the Zapruder film.

But despite our agreement that neither of our methods can establish the maximum number of shots fired, the situations are not really analogous as you seem to indicate; for your findings have already been presented, and presented by CBS in such a way as to give the public the false impression that the three shots you specify do in fact represent the maximum (as well as the minimum). This of course is a crucial determination, for it is well understood that no more than three shots, and certainly not as many as five, could have been fired from the Mannlicher-Carcano. Therefore, CBS' presentation of your findings as scientific proof that there were three shots and no more than three constituted an indispensable prop to its defense of the Warren Commission's lone-assassin theory; whereas a disclosure by CBS that your findings did not establish the maximum number of shots fired would have seriously undermined this prop. On the other hand, my acknowledgment that the five shots detectable by my method fix only the minimum number fired in no way invalidates the thesis that the Commission's three-shot lone-assassin case is untenable.

Although I found interesting your opinion that CBS had no reason to inform the public of the limitation imposed by your method, I must point out--with all due respect--that the question in my letter ~~of May 31~~ of May 31, which I had posed earlier on May 16, was addressed not to a matter of opinion, but to one of fact; i.e., was CBS informed of the time-resolution limitation in your study (whether the one-second limitation you specified in your letter of May 10, or the one-half second mentioned by you on June 8)?

Sincerely yours,

Raymond Marcus